

RE: Your complaint

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Dienstag, 28. Juli 2009 23:13:01

An: senior.proctor@proctors.ox.ac.uk

1 Anlage

[to Profes...doc](#) (32,5 KB)

Dear Professor Williams,
Please see the enclosed letter.
Sincerely,
Kevin Galalae

28 July 2009.

Dear Professor Williams,

Let me begin by thanking you for taking the time to consider my case and for reaching a decision that would allow the Department of Continuing Education the opportunity to rectify the wrongs it has subjected me to.

While on the face of it this is an elegant way to facilitate a solution at the department level to a largely self-created problem, it also subjects me to the judgement of employees who are beholden to the highest ranking person within the department, who is none other than Professor Michie. Since Professor Michie has already upheld Mr. Healy's decision to expel me from the course, it is safe to say that if the three person panel were to decide in my favour they would have to do so knowing full well that their decision would contradict that of their superior, Professor Michie, and would most likely have negative repercussions on their standing within the department and may even jeopardize their employment. Therefore, asking me to allow a three person intra-departmental panel to reconsider my case while at the same time removing my ability to appeal to a higher authority, such as the University Proctors, whose members are not beholden to Professor Michie, is a risk I am not willing to take.

The rationale for my reluctance to subject myself to such a panel without the security of recourse to a higher and truly independent authority outside the Department of Continuing Education rests on the following considerations:

1. The outcome would be more or less predetermined by the collegial and hierarchical pressures bearing on the members of the panel, whoever they may happen to be.

2. This would allow the very people who have already misused their authority to indirectly influence a last decision and thus bury my case.
3. My faith in the ability and/or willingness of the decision makers at the Department of Continuing Education to uphold the university's rules, let alone to act impartially and fairly, has been eroded by the three flawed decision made by Dr. De Grandis, Mr. Healy and Professor Michie, respectively.
4. Since the previous decisions made at the Department of Continuing Education concerning my case sacrificed impartiality, fairness and due process to bias and double standards when there was nothing to lose other than the university's good reputé, any succeeding decision will be even less likely to be fair since the new adjudicators now have to contend with more dire repercussion to themselves and to their department should they come to a different conclusion.
5. All decision makers at the Department of Continuing Education have so far compromised their duties and have consequently caused me great personal grief and immeasurable harm to my professional, academic and social reputation, not to mention my state of being. Asking me to continue to dedicate my valuable time and renewed effort to seek justice from the very people who have denied me justice is tantamount to asking violated people to face their violators in court while also giving the violators the right to be the judges.

Given these considerations, I would like to ask you to uphold my mandated right to appeal any and all departmental decisions to the higher authority of the Proctors' office. Only then will I concede to subject myself to what is more likely than not going to be a predetermined outcome.

As a successful consultant, husband and father, my time is precious and if I am to continue fighting for my constitutionally protected rights than I should not be faulted for choosing to do this in an environment where impartiality is guaranteed and obligations to the law endure thanks to respect for the conditions which generated them.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae